DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 126 EA 012 525

AUTHOR Johnson, Bruce: Sloan, Charles A.
TITLE A Study of Elementary School Principals' Self-Perceptions of Change Agent Behavior. Procedures for Adopting Educational Innovations/CBAM Colleague Report.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Aug 77
NOTE 34p.: Appendixes may be marginally legible.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes: *Administrator Role: *Change Agents: Educational Change: Elementary Education: *Leadership: *Principals: Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS Illinois

ABSTRACT

Ninety-five elementary principals from 14 northern Illinois school districts participated in a study of the role of school principals in bringing about educational change. The study indicated that elementary school principals recognized needs for establishing effective communication and good working relationships with their constituents. Principals utilized a variety of methods for actively promoting change. Central office personnel rated experienced principals and those employing paid teacher aides as deeply involved in change more often than inexperienced principals and than principals who did not employ paid aides. Demographic characteristics did not seem crucial factors in predicting which principals would initiate change. In general, the principals were aware of the behaviors necessary to implement change. The questionnaires used in the study are included as appendixes to this document. Also included is a review and discussion of the study by members of the staff of the Procedures for Adopting Educational Innovations/Concerns-Based Adoption Model Program (PAEI/CBAM) of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas at Austin. (Author/PGD)

A STUDY OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' SELF-PERCEPTIONS OF CHANGE AGENT BEHAVIOR

by

Bruce Johnson
Rugen Elementary School, Glenview, Illinois

and

Charles A. Sloan
Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois

August 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Keeping in touch with others who are interested in the study of change is an enjoyable activity for the staff of the Procedures for Adopting Educational Innovations/Concerns-Based Adoption Model Program of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. Keeping in touch entails sharing findings, measures, publications, experiences, and hypotheses with others who are grappling with the study of change and related problems. We find that many useful avenues for future research and important "aha's" result from these interactions.

As a part of this exchange of ideas around the theme of change in educational institutions, the PAEI/CBAM crew decided to begin a series of "CBAM Colleague Reports." From time to time as our collaborating colleagues conduct an interesting study, propose a new concept, or raise a thought-provoking issue, we would like to preserve them in the narrative record. That way they can be readily available to stimulate further discussion.

The publication of these CBAM Colleague Reports does not mean that NIE, UTR&D, or the PAEI/CBAM staff necessarily agree with the ideas or points made in the reports. What it does mean is that we think that the report can serve as a useful tool or catalyst to further advance the study of change.

However, being the talkative people that we are, we are allowing ourselves a few pages for members of the program staff to "review and comment" on each report. In the PAEI/CBAM Program Staff Review and Discussion section, we would like to begin the further dialogue by pointing out particular aspects of the report that were interesting, new, or that we simply agree with, or disagree with, from our perspective.

This report by Bruce Johnson and Charles Sloan fits our expectations. An interesting study had been done, and the study offers interesting points for

discussion as well as implications for future studies. Consequently, a lively interaction has ensued between Archie George and Bill Rutherford of the PAEI/CBAM staff and the authors. That dialogue is briefly represented in the Review and Discussion section.

With this report, the CBAM Colleague Reports series is launched to encourage research on change, stimulate discussion, introduce new ideas, and to improve future studies. This report is the beginning of what will hopefully be a long and challenging dialogue for the better understanding of the change process and how to facilitate and personalize the experience.

Gene E. Hall
Program Director

A STUDY OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' SELF-PERCEPTIONS OF CHANGE AGENT BEHAVIOR

by

Bruce Johnson and Charles A. Sloan

The study reported in this monograph was a research topic for a doctoral dissertation at Northern Illinois University. The study was generated as a research interest of the authors and completed in April of 1976. Further, they collaborated with research interests of the CBAM Program at the University of Texas, Gene E. Hall, Program Director.

The entire discussion was entitled THE SELF-PERCEIVED ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR EXHIBITED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN BRINGING ABOUT CHANGE. Interested persons may contact the authors or review same in ERIC documents or Dissertation Abstracts.

Dr. Johnson is principal of Rugen Elementary School in Glenview, Illinois. Dr. Sloan is Chairman, Department of Elementary Education, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois.

INTRODUCTION

For the past several decades, researchers have been examining leadership from the perspective of what enables individuals in leadership positions to affect meaningful change. These studies have encompassed psychological approaches as well as sociological approaches. However, a more recent approach to the study of leadership has evolved by focusing on observed behavior in

specific situations.[1] Such an approach is useful to the active school administrator because it focuses on what is happening rather than on finding the supposed causes of observed behavior (thereby providing the practicing school administrator with direction regarding appropriate change behavior).

There is little question that leadership studies are warranted in all phases of education. This is particularly obvious when one examines re arch by Mort and Ross, who suggested that the average American school lagged twenty-five years behind the best educational practice available and that fifty years elapsed between the development of a new educational practice and its adoption in all public schools.[2] Further, the literature reveals a paradox for elementary school principals. On one hand, they are expected to comply to a societal prescribed role which causes a maintenance of present normative behavior, while on the other hand, dynamic leadership is essential to keep pace with society. Because of this perplexing situation regarding how elementary school principals viewed their role in bringing about change, this study was developed.

RESEARCH EFFORT

Given the tremendous diffusion lag that exists in education and the paucity of research available for guiding the behavior of the practicing school administrator, the authors elected to examine administrative behaviors which have proven useful in bringing about change, thereby hopefully reducing this tremendous diffusion lag. In examining educational change in the elementary school setting, the behavior of the elementary school principal was chosen for investigation because s/he occupies a strategic leadership position. Evidence of this crucial position is presented in the literature. Demeter, following a study concerning improved educational practices, concludes that:

> School principals are key figures in the process (of innovation). Where they are both aware of and sympathetic to an

> innovation, it tends to prosper. Where they are ignorant if not hostile, it tends to remain outside the blood stream of the school.[3]

This study was designed to determine the self-perceived administrative behaviors elementary school principals utilize in bringing about change. Change, for purposes of this study, implies that "between time 1 and time 2 some noticeable alteration has taken place in something."[4] In an effort to further clarify the study's direction, the following four research questions were examined:

1. What self-perceived administrative behaviors do elementary school principals utilize in bringing about change?
2. Was there a relationship between the elementary school principals' degree of involvement in change as assessed by a committee of central office administrators and selected demographic characteristics of elementary school principals?
3. Was there a relationship between the self-perceived administrative behavior of elementary school principals and selected demographic characteristics?
4. Was there a relationship between the elementary school principals' degree of involvement in change as assessed by a committee of central office administrators and the self-perceived administrative behavior of the elementary school principals?

The geographical area under consideration for this research project consisted of fourteen school districts in the northern Illinois region. Care was taken to secure both rural and urban sites, thereby making the findings more applicable to other regions of the country.

STUDY METHODS AND PROCEDURES

In light of the information presented in the literature, a study was designed to answer the four research questions set forth previously. Twenty-five northern Illinois public school districts were contacted to solicit their support and cooperation in the research project. After a follow-up letter and a few telephone calls, fourteen school districts agreed to participate.

Official letters of participation were received from the fourteen school district superintendents or official designee. One hundred sixteen elementary school principals from the fourteen school districts were included in the study. The ninety-five elementary school principals who elected to participate represented 87 percent of those originally contacted.

A genuine effort was made to obtain a cross-section of elementary school principals. The principals contacted and those who elected to participate represented school districts of varying size. Table 1 contains information regarding the relative size of school districts based on total number of elementary school principals employed in their district.

Table 1

Relative Size of School Districts Based on Total Number of Elementary School Principals

Number of Elementary School Principals in the School District	Number of School Districts	
	Number of Districts	Percent of Total
1-2	4	28.5
4-8	7	50.0
14-31	3	21.5
Total 116	14	100.0

The study was conducted in two major phases. First, school superintendents in the northern Illinois area were contacted regarding their possible participation in the research project. Upon their agreeing to participate, the school superintendent was asked to assemble a committee of central office administrators for the purpose of evaluating each district's elementary school principals regarding their involvement in change. This rating was to take place

using the Elementary School Principal Rating Form developed by the authors (see Appendix A). The design of this rating scale was in accordance with internal change agent functions as presented in the change literature.[5] The rationale underlying such a rating scale was that to be a successful change agent, an innovation must pass through several phases before it could be fully implemented within a particular school. As assumed at the outset, the ratings of the elementary school principals by the committee(s) of central office administrators allowed the authors to place each of the elementary school principals, using the total score, into one of three categories of change agents. They were: (1) comprehensive (Scores of 4.0 to 5.0); (2) moderate (Scores of 3.0 to 3.9); and (3) non-change (Scores of 1.0 to 2.9). Table 2 contains information regarding the change agent categories with the number of elementary school principals in each category.

Table 2

Change Agent Categories with the Number of Elementary School Principals in Each Category

Change Agent Categories	Number of Elementary School Principals in Each Category	
	Number	Percent of Total
Comprehensive	24	25.3
Moderate	41	43.2
Non-Change	30	31.5
Total	95	100.0

Following the completion of this rating by the committee(s) of central office administrators, each elementary school principal was contacted by his/her

school superintendent and requested to complete the second phase of the study. This second phase consisted of two instruments: a demographic assessment and a change behavior assessment. The first instrument, the Demographic Survey Instrument, consisted of twenty questions with responses (see Appendix B). The information sought was summarized under four general categories. These include: Personal Information, Educational Information, School and School District Information, and Change Information. Selection of the demographic questions was determined only after a careful examination of those categories utilized by other researchers such as Rogers.

The second instrument, the Change Behavior Survey Instrument, was constructed in an effort to gain insight into the self-perceived administrative behaviors elementary school principals utilized in bringing about change in the elementary school setting. (See Appendix C.) The instrument was constructed using generalizations found primarily in ten texts and research reports. These sources dealt with the manner in which innovators/change agents had previously behaved in accomplishing educational change.[6] The fifty-three items focused on the principal's behavior as a change agent. A Likert Scale composed of ratings from one to nine, with anchor points of (1) zero degree, (5) moderate degree, and (9) great degree, was chosen for use in the survey instrument. It was also determined to group the items into the three main constituents that elementary school principals relate to in their daily functions: (1) behaviors utilized with central office administrators; (2) behaviors utilized with the school faculty; and (3) behaviors utilized with the school community.

In an effort to gain further precision with the instrument's basic format and content, the instrument was mailed to a panel of experts consisting of ten professionals outside Northern Illinois University. They were individuals in the following professional roles:

1. Five professors of educational administration and/or supervision
2. A public school superintendent
3. An elementary school principal
4. Two executives for professional associations
5. An administrator in a university

All ten persons returned the survey instrument with comments and suggestions. These suggestions were then utilized in constructing the final draft of the change behavior instrument.

Prior to the distribution of the instrument to the study population, two additional steps were taken. First, the instrument was administered on a pre- and post-test (three week interval) basis to a group (n = 15 useable questionnaires) of school administration graduate students in a effort to achieve a measure of reliability. An analysis of the findings revealed that only five of the fifty-three items received a correlation of less than .40.[7] These items were modified and included because of their judged importance.

The second step prior to distribution to the study population involved the categorization of the behaviors included in the survey instrument. The behaviors were grouped into three major categories. The behavior categories and accompanying definitions are included below:[8]

1. Communication Behaviors: Communication refers to behavioral actions by the elementary school principal which increase the understanding of and knowledge about what is happening in the organization.
2. Consideration Behaviors: Consideration refers to behavioral acts by the principal which are indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the principal and his associates.
3. Thrust Behaviors: Thrust refers to task oriented behavioral acts by the principal characterized by his effort(s) in trying to "move the organization."

In an effort to achieve agreement on this categorization, the items included in the survey instrument were placed by the authors using the above definitions in one of the three categories. This categorization was then examined by a committee of professors (n = 6) and consensus was reached regarding the proper placement of each item.

The data received from the elementary school principals and central office administrators were analyzed by two programs from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The programs utilized were the ONE-WAY ANALYSIS for the Change Behavior Survey Instrument and CROSSTABS for the Demographic Instrument.

DISCUSSION

Behaviors Utilized: A prominent result of the study was that the elementary school principals reported that they utilized the vast majority (49) of the fifty-three (53) change behaviors at moderate or comprehensive degrees in an effort to affect change. Regarding communication behaviors, the elementary school principals did not distinguish among their constituents, i.e., they communicated to a large extent with faculty members, central office administrators, and school community members. Further, elementary school principals reported that they utilized consideration behaviors, other than the behaviors of selecting confidants and socializing, to a high degree. The results of the consideration and communication behavior items were not surprising given their preponderance in the current research literature. Numerous researchers have continually pointed out the importance of creating an atmosphere or climate where change can flourish. One such author, Tye, suggested that establishing an atmosphere of cooperation within the groups of a system was of paramount importance. Within this atmosphere, opportunities for interaction, encouraging broad-based decision

making, facilitating open communication and concerning oneself with interpersonal relationships must be provided for by the change agent.[9] Still another noted author, Miles, concluded that once people have established clear communication with each other, the old incorrect norm loses some of its force.[10]

In addition to the high utilization of communication and consideration behaviors, several thrust behaviors also received moderate to comprehensive usage. The thrust behaviors involving the change agent as a process helper, evaluator of faculty skills, provider of resources, knower of the innovation, and director of a systematic plan were utilized to a high degree. Again, these behaviors were in congruence with the suggestions of the change literature. Novotney suggested that the change agent must intensify within the organization a desire and readiness not only to recognize a problem in the existing structure, but also to make a united effort to bring about a change which will remedy the difficulty. Further, Novotney stated that because most individuals have a basic need for structure, they want to know what is expected of them, how to proceed, and how much time they will be expected to devote to the innovation.[11] Regarding systematic planning with the faculty, Rogers and Shoemaker set forth two generalizations regarding successful change agent behavior. They concluded that a change agent's success was positively related to his clients' orientation and the degree to which his program was compatible with clients' needs.[12] Novotney suggested further that a change agent must collect a detailed description of all fixed inputs which may help achieve the change desired. Included in this analysis would be what various people can do and how they operate under various sets of circumstances. In this manner, the elementary school principal can place individuals in situations which are most advantageous for the achievement of the stated objectives.[13]

It should also be stated that some change behaviors received little repeated utilization by the elementary school principals involved in the study. Among these behaviors were two consideration behaviors associated with the selection of confidants among all constituents and socialization with central office administrators and school community members. In addition, the thrust behaviors regarding manipulation of central office administrators and school community members, bypassing of central office administrators, avoidance of board policy, and refusing to become a faculty scapegoat also received a low degree of utilization. These behaviors were in contrast to the recommendations of other researchers. One researcher, Wallace, suggested that as unsettling as it might be, an effective change agent must be an effective manipulator. In addition, he indicated much of a change agent's time will be spent hand-holding, listening, supporting, peace-making, planning, and evaluating to promote the innovation.[14] Moreover, Goldhammer, in describing principals of his beacons of brilliance schools, stated that they were superb tacticians. In addition, these principals "knew the ropes, and didn't hesitate to manipulate people, resources, or policies to get the resources they needed for those programs, even when it meant going over their superiors' heads."[15]

Change Classification and Demographic Data: The results of the investigation strongly suggested that experienced elementary school principals were more likely to be classified as comprehensive change agents than beginning elementary school principals. Table 3 contains information relating to the years of administrative experience of the elementary school principal and change agent classification. Number of years of administrative experience was a significant difference (.01) inasmuch as only one elementary principal with less than five years of administrative experience was classified as a comprehensive change agent, whereas twenty-three elementary school principals with six or

more years of administrative experience were so classified. The finding was substantiated in the literature by Tye, who stated that it was crucial that the administrator knows where he stands in relation to those with whom he works. Knowing oneself and attempting to make one's behavior consistent with what one believes is an important place to begin organizing for planned change, according to Tye.[16] Further, Rogers and Shoemaker generalized that a change agent's success is positively related to his "credibility" in the eyes of his clients. This credibility will be established over a period of time as the client and change agent develop a good working relationship.[17]

Table 3

Chi Square Table Relating the Years of Administrative Experience of the Elementary School Principal and Change Agent Classification

Years of Administrative Experience	Comprehensive Change Agent		Moderate Change Agent		Non-Change Agent		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
1-5	1	4.0	17	68.0	7	28.0	25	26.3
6-9	12	36.4	13	39.4	8	24.2	33	34.7
10 and over.	11	29.7	11	29.7	15	40.5	37	38.9
Total	24	25.3	41	43.2	30	31.6	95	100.0

$X^2 = 13.21$ (df = 4) Significance = .01

The second important conclusion which can be drawn from this portion of the study was that elementary school principals who employed paid teacher aides were more likely to be classified as comprehensive change agents that those who did not do so. The number of paid teacher aides was found to be significant (.01) inasmuch as over 40 percent of those elementary school principals with

three or less teacher aides were classified as non-change agents. In comparison, 13.9 percent of the elementary school principals with four or more teacher aides were so classified. Table 4 below contains the information relating to the number of paid teacher aides in the elementary school(s) and the change agent classification.

Table 4

Chi Square Table Relating the Number of Paid Teacher Aides in the Elementary School(s) and Change Agent Classification

Number of Paid Teacher Aides	Comprehensive Change Agent		Moderate Change Agent		Non-Change Agent		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
0-3	12	20.7	22	37.9	24	41.4	58	61.7
4 or more	12	33.3	19	52.8	5	13.9	36	38.3
Total	24	25.5	41	43.6	29	30.9	94	100.0

$X^2 = 7.95$ (df = 2) Significance = .01

As Novotney determined, the change agent must ask the question, "What do I have at my disposal to help achieve the change I seek?"[18] One can hypothesize that with today's growing teacher militancy, it may be essential to provide human resources in the form of teacher aides as a means to bring about significant educational change. A teacher characterized as a rate-buster will almost certainly receive criticism from fellow employees in today's educational arena, and may be forced to conform to the expectation of the work group. This finding is in keeping with the well-known Hawthorne studies.

Change Behavior and Demographic Data: While a few demographic characteristics did indicate a relationship with some change behaviors, it can be

concluded that factors other than demographic characteristics play a larger role in determining whether or not elementary school principals elected to initiate change in the elementary school educational setting. Such a finding, although somewhat surprising, was nevertheless enlightening as it tends to support the assumption that something other than demographic statistics plays the crucial role in determining effective change agents.

Change Classification and Change Behavior: First, it can be concluded from the study that elementary school principals were cognitively aware of the administrative behaviors necessary to implement change, regardless of their change agent classification by the committees of central office administrators. This finding was strongly evident in that only four of the fifty-three behavior items showed a statistically significant relationship with the change agent classification. Secondly, the investigation revealed that comprehensive change agents demonstrated a greater use of three important concepts; they were: (1) developing the innovation as a group endeavor (Item 015); (2) rewarding the faculty through visible recognition (Item 024); and (3) systematically evaluating the innovation (Item 021). Table 5 contains information regarding the relationship between the behavior items with faculty members regarding consideration (Items 015, 024) and thrust (Items 021, 027) and change agent classification. It should be noted that the four significant differences were in relation to the principals' self-reported behavior toward faculty members. There were no significant differences between the comprehensive change principals' self-reported behavior and their relationship to central office administrators and community members.

The finding that comprehensive change agents did in fact systematically evaluate the innovation is of special mention as this behavior is frequently ignored in the change process Flanagan stated that evaluation of education

change was one of the most neglected aspects of the change program. He further stated that it is only through such evaluation that a rational decision can be made regarding the continuance or discontinuance of an innovation, as well as developing essential plans for continuous improvement of an innovation which will remain in operation.[19] Further, in his strong advocacy for systematic evaluation, Novotney concluded that the "success or failure of a change implementation process can be measured only in terms of the degree to which one has or has not achieved the objectives originally sought."[20]

Table 5

A Summary of the Four Significant Relationships Between the Behavior Items Regarding Consideration and Thrust with Faculty Members and Change Agent Classification

Behavior Item(s)	Comprehensive Change Agent			Moderate Change Agent			Non-Change Agent			
	Mean	S.D.	No.	Mean	S.D.	No.	Mean	S.D.	No.	Sig.
015	8.50	1.35	24	8.00	1.75	40	7.21	2.53	29	.05
024	8.48	1.38	23	7.24	2.01	41	7.40	2.25	30	.05
021	8.00	1.77	24	6.27	2.09	41	6.60	2.25	30	.01
027	2.67	2.33	24	4.22	2.86	41	3.34	2.27	29	.05

Thirdly, it is noteworthy to mention the differences in the principals' behavior in relation to the behavior item (027, Table 5), manipulation of faculty members. The data demonstrate that moderate change agents utilized this behavior significantly differently than comprehensive or non-change agent elementary school principals. Wallace[21] noted manipulation of faculty in a study of adoption agents in 1974 as a necessary behavior for change agents to utilize in order to implement new programs.

SUMMARY

In summary, the following seven statements with discussion are presented with respect to the findings and conclusions of this study:

1. Elementary school principals recognized the need for effective communication with their constituents in an effort to bring about change in the educational setting. All of the behaviors in this category were highly rated by the principals.

2. Elementary school principals were cognizant of the necessity for establi ing a good working relationship between themselves and their three important constituents (faculty, central office administrators, and school community). This finding emphasizes that administrative theory and practice adopted over the past two decades permeates the self-reported behavior of practicing administrators at the elementary school level, i.e., elementary school principals identified as change agents report that they adhere to the principles of participatory management. Moreover, change agent elementary school principals reported greater utilization of two behaviors. They were:

   a. The innovations were developed utilizing group processes.

   b. Elementary school principals visibly recognized and rewarded fac- members for their accomplishments.

3. Elementary school principals utilized a variety of thrust behaviors, defined as efforts to "move the organization" in bringing about change. It should be noted that persons identified as comprehensive change agents demonstrated the need for evaluating the innovation on a systematic basis. This was a distinguishing behavior from the performance of persons not viewed as change agents.

4. Experienced elementary school principals (with more than five years experience) were more likely to be classified as comprehensive change agents

than beginning elementary school principals. It may be that establishing credibility through time in the role plays an important function in the change process.

5. Elementary school principals who employed paid teacher aides were more likely to be classified as comprehensive change agents. It may be that this factor is (1) a means of assisting faculty members to accomplish change, (2) the impetus to attempt changes, and probably (3) a reward for their efforts.

6. Factors other than the demographic characteristics examined played a larger role in determining whether or not elementary school principals initiated change in the educational setting.

7. Elementary school principals were cognitively aware of the administrative behaviors necessary to implement change, regardless of their change agent classification. They agreed with the literature on change behavior on a self-report basis. However, it should be noted that only 25.3 percent of these persons were evaluated by central office administrators as comprehensive change agents.

NOTES

1. Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 119.

2. Everett M. Rogers, Diffusion of Innovation (New York: The Free Press of Science, 1962), p. 41.

3. Owens, p. 146.

4. Matthew B. Miles, "Educational Innovation: The Nature of the Problem," Innovation in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles (New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1964), p. 13.

5. Everett M. Rogers, "What Are Innovators Like?" Change Processes in the Public Schools (Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965), pp. 55-61.

6. Ten primary sources were utilized in the construction of the instrument. A complete list of these sources can be obtained from the authors upon request.

7. It was concluded that while five of the items received a correlation of less than .40 on the pre- and posttest, they should, nevertheless, remain a part of the instrument because of strong emphasis in the literature.

8. Adapted in part from John K. Hemphill and Alvin E. Coons, "Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, eds. Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons (Columbus, Ohio: The Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957), p. 8; see also Andrew W. Halpin, "Leadership Behavior and Combat Performance of Airplane Commanders," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49: 19-22, January, 1954; see also Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research (New York: The Free Press, 1974), p. 143.

9. Kenneth A. Tye, "The Elementary School Principal: Key to Educational Change," The Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator, eds. Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), pp. 29-30.

10. Matthew B. Miles, "The Development of Innovative Climates in Educational Organizations," Journal for the Study of Change (published in Nijmegen, Netherlands), 1:28, 1972.

11. Fr. Jerrold M. Novotney, "The Principal: The Key to Educational Change," The Catholic School Journal, 68:72, February, 1968.

12. Everett M. Rogers and F. Floyd Shoemaker, Communication of Innovations (New York: The Free Press, 1971), pp. 237-245.

13. Jerrold M. Novotney, "How to Manage Change," School Board Journal, 155:25, December, 1967.

14. Richard C. Wallace, Jr., Each His Own Man: The Role of Adoption Agents in the Implementation of Personalized Teacher Education (Austin, Texas: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1974), pp. 36-37.

15. Keith Goldhammer and Gerald L. Becker, "What Makes a Good Elementary School Principal?" American Education, 6:11, April, 1970.

16. Tye, pp. 26-27.

17. Rogers and Shoemaker, pp. 237-245.

18. Novotney, "How to Manage Change," p. 25.

19. John C. Flanagan, Administrative Behavior in Implementing Educational Innovations, U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document. ED 123 182, February, 1968.

20. Novotney, "How to Manage Change," p. 26.

21. Wallace.

APPENDICES

A. Elementary School Principal Rating Form

B. Demographic Survey Instrument

C. Change Behavior Survey Instrument

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL RATING FORM

Elementary School Principal's Name_____

School District = _____

Please rate, by circling the appropriate number on the continuum, the extent to which the elementary school principal listed above performed the following functions in bringing about change in the elementary school:

Function	Extent of Functions Performed				
	Zero Extent	Little Extent	Some Extent	Considerable Extent	Great Extent
1. Diagnosed the need for change(s).	1	2	3	4	5
2. Initiated innovation(s) based on the diagnosis.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Implemented the necessary innovation(s).	1	2	3	4	5
4. Dispersed the innovation(s) throughout the elementary school.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Sustained the implemented innovation(s).	1	2	3	4	5
6. Continued to systematically evaluate the innovation(s).	1	2	3	4	5
7. Prescribed improvements in the innovation(s).	1	2	3	4	5

Please list, if any, the innovation(s) this elementary school principal has initiated:

_____

_____

_____

Demographic Information

Name_____

School District_____

Please place a check (✓) before the response which best describes you or your present situation:

1. Sex:

___1. Male
___2. Female

2. Age:

___1. 20-29
___2. 30-39
___3. 40-49
___4. 50-59
___5. 60-69
___6. 70-79

3. Education (highest degree earned):

___1. B.S.
___2. B.S.+
___3. M.S.
___4. M.S.+
___5. C.A.S.
___6. Ph.D. or Ed.D.

4. Years of Administrative Experience (full-time, any level):

___1. 1-2
___2. 3-5
___3. 6-9
___4. 10-14
___5. 15-20
___6. 21 or more

5. Years of Teaching Experience (full-time, any level):

___1. 0
___2. 1-2
___3. 3-5
___4. 6-9
___5. 10-14
___6. 15-20
___7. 21 or more

6. Years of Non-Education Work Experience (full-time):

___1. 0
___2. 1-2
___3. 3-5
___4. 6-9
___5. 10-14
___6. 15-20
___7. 21 or more

7. Nature and Location of Position Held Prior to Present Principalship:

___1. Teacher Within Present District
___2. Teacher Within Another District
___3. Assistant Principal Within Present District
___4. Assistant Principal Within Another District
___5. Principal Within Present District
___6. Principal Within Another District
___7. Other (specify)_____

8. Number of Schools You Administer:

___1. 1
___2. 2
___3. 3
___4. 4 or more

9. Student Population of School(s) You Administer:

___1. 1-199
___2. 200-299
___3. 300-399
___4. 400-499
___5. 500-599
___6. 600-699
___7. 700-799
___8. 800-899
___9. 900-999
___10. 1000 or more (specify)_____

APPENDIX B

(Over)

10. Student Population of the School District:

___1. 1-499
___2. 500-999
___3. 1000-1999
___4. 2000-2999
___5. 3000-3999
___6. 4000 or more
(specify)_____

11. Number of Full-Time Teachers in School(s) You Administer:

___1. 1-9
___2. 10-19
___3. 20-29
___4. 30-39
___5. 40 or more
(specify)_____

12. Number of Paid Teacher Aides and/or Paraprofessionals (full-time equivalents) in School(s) You Administer:

___1. 0
___2. 1-3
___3. 4-6
___4. 7-9
___5. 10-12
___6. 13-15
___7. 16 or more
(specify)_____

13. Number of Volunteer Aides (full-time equivalents) in School(s) You Administer:

___1. 0
___2. 1-5
___3. 6-10
___4. 11-19
___5. 20-29
___6. 30 or more

14. Pupil/Teacher Ratio (excluding paid or volunteer aides) in School(s) You Administer:

	Pupil		Teacher
___1.	10-15	:	1
___2.	16-20	:	1
___3.	21-25	:	1
___4.	26-30	:	1
___5.	31 or more	:	1

15. Immediate Supervisor in Present Position:

___1. Director of Elementary Education
___2. Assistant Superintendent for Personnel
___3. Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education
___4. Superintendent
___5. Other (specify)_____

16. Does the School(s) Have an Established Parent-Advisory Committee That Regularly Meets With You?

___1. Yes
___2. No

17. Were You Appointed to Your Present Position to Implement Change?

___1. Yes
___2. No

18. Do You View Your Present Role as a Change Agent?

___1. Yes
___2. No

19. Do You View Your Current Position As a Long-Term Professional Assignment?

___1. Yes
___2. No

20. Do You View Your Position as Possessing Status?

___1. Yes
___2. No

BEHAVIORS UTILIZED BY THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Directions: Please indicate to what degree you utilized the following behaviors in working with your (1) faculty, (2) central office administrators, and (3) community in bringing about change or innovation in your school by circling the appropriate number on the continuum.

Rating Scale: 1 = zero degree of utilization
5 = moderate degree of utilization
9 = great degree of utilization

BEHAVIORS WITH THE FACULTY

As an elementary school principal in bring ing about change, I . . .	Degree of Utilization: Zero			Moderate			Great		
1. provided in-service training for the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. socialized with the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. provided and maintained systematic planning with the faculty regarding the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. empathized with the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. knew the innovation thoroughly prior to proposing it to the entire faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. developed effective communication channels to keep the faculty informed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. was a scapegoat for the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. stimulated a spirit of high morale among the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9. used outside consultants to assist in the development of the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. educated the faculty on the importance of school community acceptance of th innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. demonstrated patience with faculty members who failed to change.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12. acted as a process-helper for the faculty throughout the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
13. developed credibility in the eyes of the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
14. evaluated the knowledge and skills of each faculty member.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15. developed the innovation as a group endeavor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
16. provided the necessary linkage desired by the faculty to resources (materials, technology, and people).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
17. used my veto power to overrule undesirable faculty decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
18. exerted care in faculty interpersonal relations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

(Over)

		Zero			Moderate			Great		
19.	interacted with faculty groups regarding the progress of the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
20.	determined my appropriate level of faculty intervention.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
21.	evaluated the innovation a systematic basis with the faculty.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
22.	chose confidants among the faculty carefully.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
23.	worked through known faculty decision-makers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
24.	provided visibility and recognition for faculty members regarding noteworthy accomplishments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
25.	acted as a solution-giver for the faculty throughout the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
26.	accepted ideas from the faculty regarding innovations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
27.	manipulated faculty members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

BEHAVIORS WITH CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS

As an elementary school principal in bringing about change, I . . .

28.	assured central office administrators that the innovation was in their best interest.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
29.	socialized with central office administrators.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
30.	manipulated central office administrators.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
31.	developed effective communication channels to keep central office administrators informed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
32.	chose confidants among central office administrators carefully.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
33.	avoided board of education policies that hindered implementation of the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
34.	was empathetic with the position of central office administrators.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
35.	communicated with central office administrators in terms of their values and norms.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
36.	used central office administrators to persuade the faculty of the importance of the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
37.	developed credibility in the eyes of central office administrators.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
38.	by-passed lower level central office administrators and dealt directly with the superintendent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
39.	communicated in an open and direct manner with central office administrators.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
40.	by-passed the superintendent and dealt directly with the board of education.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

BEHAVIORS WITH THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY

As an elementary school principal in bringing about change, I . . .

	Zero			Moderate			Great		
41. developed effective communication channels to keep school community members informed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
42. socialized with school community members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
43. developed long-range, systematic plans to insure general public understanding of the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
44. developed credibility in the eyes of school community members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
45. replied promptly and courteously to all inquiries from parents and other school community members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
46. continually evaluated the school community relations plan(s).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
47. chose confidants among the school community carefully.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
48. maintained a steady flow of informative communication through a variety of media to the school community.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
49. developed interest and support for the innovation in the school community.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
50. provided recognition for school community members who contributed to the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
51. manipulated school community members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
52. encouraged parents to confer with faculty and administrators regarding the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
53. utilized community action committees to assist in various phases of the innovation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

PAEI/CBAM PROGRAM STAFF
REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

Johnson and Sloan's study is a useful addition to the literature in an area where more and better research is badly needed. Although there is widespread agreement on the importance of school principals as change agents, much remains to be known about the factors that contribute to effective change agent behavior.

Efforts of the authors to include a large sample of principals in the study are to be commended. A particularly significant contribution of the study is the Change Behavior Survey Instrument which was the result of a careful development process. Also interesting was the use of central office administrators for rating the change behavior of principals, but this process also introduced some problems into the study.

Since the classification of principals into three categories of change agents was so important to other aspects, it would have been helpful to have more information on how much knowledge the central office administrators had about the change agent behavior of the principals they rated. Were their ratings of the principals in the 1-5 year class as valid as those of the principals in the other two classes? This question is prompted by the placement of 68 percent of the 1-5 year principals in the Moderate category. This "middle-ground" placement of such a large percent of those principals suggests it may have been the result of not knowing as much about their behavior as about other principals'. Perhaps this concern would have been alleviated had the authors commented on the reliability of the system administrator ratings.

It is true that experienced principals were more often classified as comprehensive change agents than beginning principals. However, a higher proportion

of principals with extensive experience were classified as non-change agents than were classified as comprehensive change agents. In the group of principals with ten or more years of experience, eleven were rated as comprehensive change agents, while fifteen were rated as non-change agents. Years of experience would appear to be a very risky variable for choosing principals who will be good change agents.

The fifty-three items included in the Change Behavior Survey Instrument represent a very useful collection of possible principal behaviors. In the eyes of these reviewers, this carefully developed listing of salient principal behaviors, a list that has potential for use in many ways, is one of the key contributions of the study. The findings from this section lead to a number of questions that might be considered in future research. Is it common for all principals, regardless of their change agent role/performance, to be so alike in their self-described administrative behavior? If this is true, then it may be that principal self-perceptions are not very useful, at least in regards to areas represented on the Change Behavior Survey Instrument. On the other hand, is it possible that the three concepts that did differentiate comprehensive principals are sufficiently powerful to be reliable indicators of comprehensive change agent behavior?

It would have been very useful to have teacher ratings of their principal on the survey instrument to compare with principal self-perceptions. This data would have made it possible to better determine if the principals in the study were actually utilizing the behaviors they claimed to be using. Also, it would have strengthened the study had the system administrators been asked to rate the principals in the three areas where principals rated themselves -- behaviors with faculty, with central office administrators, and with community. This would have made it possible for direct comparison of principal self-perceptions in the three areas with independent ratings of others.

While the Johnson and Sloan study has not resulted in information that has day-to-day utility for practitioners, they have laid the foundation and provided some instruments that should help future research.